(in

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/473,554	12/29/1999	KENNETH MCCLAMROCH	RSW9-99-119	1113

		EXAMINER
7590	07/05/2006	NGUYEN, CINDY

MARK D SIMPSON
SYNNESTVEDT & LECHNER LLP
2600 ARAMARK TOWER
1101 MARKET STREET
PHILADELPHIA, PA 191072950

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2161	

DATE MAILED: 07/05/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _04/25/06_ .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1, 5-10, 12-14, 16 and 17_ is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1,5-10,12-14,16 and 17_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _29 December 1999_ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☒ The proposed drawing correction filed on _16 August 2002_ is: a)☒ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _4_ . 6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

This is in response to communication filed 04/25/06.

Response to Applicant's Arguments

Applicant's arguments have been considered, but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1, 5-10, 12-14, 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Applicant claimed the method for **indexing** and locating code assets of diverse types stored on a storage device. However, the method for indexing was not described how to index in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Correction is required.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly
claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1, 5-10, 12-14, 16 and 17 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second

paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential steps, such omission amounting

to a gap between the steps. See MPEP § 2172.01.

It lacks the steps of indexing, **how to indexing** in the method for indexing and

locating. Correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 5-10, 12-14 and 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Cottrill (US 5963958) in view of Greenfeld (US 4931928).

Regarding claim 1, Cottrill discloses: A computer-implemented method for

indexing and locating code assets of diverse types stored on a storage device,

comprising the steps of:

identifying the asset type of, and asset-specific parameters related to said stored

assets, said asset specific parameters comprising languages in which each code asset

is written (col. 3, lines 36-53, Cottrill);

analyzing said stored assets based on said identified asset-specific parameters (

analyze the input string to extract the various parameters (col. 3, lines 66 to col. 4, lines

22, Cottrill);

extracting textual, semantic information from said stored assets, said semantic

information including semantic information specific to the asset type of each stored

asset (col. 4, lines 12-47, Cottrill);

However, Cottrill didn't disclose: performing a crawl process on said storage

device to identify stored assets; storing and indexing said extracted textual and

semantic information for retrieval. On the other hand, Greenfeld discloses: performing

a crawl process on said storage device to identify stored assets (as reading source file

from a file and keeping track of which file is currently being read and wherein within that

file the reading is accruing, col. 9, lines 3-35, Greenfeld); storing and indexing said

extracted textual and semantic information for retrieval (col. 10, lines 23-35, Greenfeld).

Thus, at the time invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of

ordinary skill in the art to include performing a crawl process on said storage device to

identify stored assets; storing and indexing said extracted textual and semantic

information for retrieval in the system of Cottrill as taught by Greenfeld. The motivation

being to enable the system provide the source code analysis utilizes a formal

programming language grammar, controls various desired databases in order to easily

accommodate many and diverse database systems, scanning and parsing source code

that is specific to a subject programming language being analyzed in order to faithfully

capture the semantics of the language (col. 3, lines 45-66, Greenfeld).

Regarding claim 5, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the

rejection of claim 1, respectively. In addition, Cottrill/Greenfield discloses: wherein said

analysis step is performed using language-specific analyzers corresponding to the

languages of said code assets (col. 3, lines 66 to col. 4, lines 22, Cottrill).

Regarding claim 6, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the

rejection of claim 1, respectively. In addition, Cottrill/Greenfield discloses: wherein said

language-specific analyzers analyze said stored assets based on predetermined

parameters specific to the language to which they correspond (col. 3, lines 35-53,

Cottrill).

Regarding claim 7, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the

rejection of claim 1. In addition, Cottrill discloses: wherein said stored assets comprise

assets of diverse types (col. 4, lines 13-47, Cottrill), with at least one of said asset types

having a corresponding asset type specific analyzer and wherein said stored assets

comprise code assets and wherein said asset specific parameters comprise languages

in which each code asset is written (col. 3, lines 35-53, Cottrill). wherein said analyzing

means comprises an analysis server, said analysis server including one or more asset

type specific servers (as CORBA server, col. 8, lines 53-67, Cottrill).

Regarding claim 8, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the

rejection of claim 7. In addition, Cottrill/ Greenfield discloses: locating means for

locating stored assets by applying a search query to said semantic information stored in

said storing and indexing means (col. 3, lines 35-53, Cottrill).

Regarding claim 9, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the

rejection of claim 8. In addition, Cottrill/ Greenfield discloses: wherein said locating

means includes means for applying a search query to said textual information stored in

said storing and indexing means (col. 3, lines 35-53, Cottrill).

Regarding claim 10, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the

rejection of claim 9. In addition, Cottrill/ Greenfield discloses: wherein said locating

means includes means for applying a search query to both said semantic information

and said textual information simultaneously (col. 3, lines 35-53, Cottrill).

Regarding claim 12, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the

rejection of claim 11. In addition, Cottrill/ Greenfield discloses: wherein a plurality of

said asset types have a corresponding asset-type specific analyzer (col. 3, lines 45-53,

Cottrill).

Regarding claim 13, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the

rejection of claim 12. In addition, Cottrill/ Greenfield discloses: wherein each of said

asset types has a corresponding asset-type specific analyzer (col. 3, lines 45-53,

Cottrill).

Regarding claim 14, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the

rejection of claim 11. In addition, Cottrill/ Greenfield discloses: wherein said asset-type

specific analyzer extracts predefined semantic information specific to the asset type to

which it corresponds (col. 3, lines 45-53, Cottrill).

Regarding claim 16, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the

rejection of claim 7, respectively. In addition, Cottrill/ Greenfield discloses: wherein said

analysis step is performed using language-specific analyzers corresponding to the

languages of said code assets (col. 3, lines 35-53, Cottrill).

Regarding claim 17, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the

rejection of claim 7, respectively. In addition, Cottrill/ Greenfield discloses: wherein said

language-specific analyzers analyze said stored assets based on predetermined

parameters specific to the language to which they correspond (col. 3, lines 35-53, Cottrill).

1.   Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

McCasland, US 5856931, Method and system for identifying organizing, scheduling, executing, analyzing and documenting detailed inspection activities for specific items in either a time based or on demand fashion.

Kraay et al. U.S 5956717, Database Origami

Agrawal el al. US 6233575, Multilevel taxonomy based on features derived from training documents classification using fisher values as discrimination values.

Gershman et al. US. 6401085, Mobile communication and computing system and method.

Eder (U.S 6321205). Method of and system for modeling and analyzing business improvement programs.

2.   Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cindy Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-4025. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 8:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 571-272-4023. The fax phone numbers

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239

for regular communications and 703-746-7240 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or

proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-

3900.

Cindy Nguyen
June 21, 2006

FRANTZ COBY
PRIMARY EXAMINER